

Who is Achieving Better Work-Life Balance? Men or Women: Study concerning IT Industry in South-India

Vidyavathi Manupadu¹, Surendra Prasad²

¹(PhD Research Scholar, Department of Business Management, University College of Commerce & Business Management, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India)

²(David Memorial PG College, Osmania University, India)

Corresponding Author: Vidyavathi Manupadu

Abstract: Changing mindsets and technological advancements have encouraged women to foray into employment and traditionally women have been burdened with familial responsibilities. In Information Technology (IT) industry, men and women share equal load and contribute equally to the growth of the organizations. The present work proposes to measure and compare Work-Life Balance (WLB) of men and women employees of IT industry. WLB is measured by considering cultural aspects of organizations which earlier works did not consider. In the present study, women are found to be achieving less WLB than men and face more interference of work into personal lives. It also identifies factors affecting the WLB of men and women. A scale consisting of 35 statements is developed for measuring WLB of the employees of IT organizations of South India. Dimensions (factors) were resolved through factor analysis. Pearson correlation analysis and Regression analysis were used to establish the relation and association between the factors and WLB.

Keywords: Culture, Factor Analysis, IT organizations, Regression Analysis, Work-Life Balance

Date of Submission: 01-09-2017

Date of acceptance: 07-09-2017

I. Introduction

Work-Life Balance (WLB) is the ability to have sufficient control over life at work and home and be productive at work and satisfied with personal life. Women actively engaged in employment are subjected to stress to manage both family and work due to the prevailing socio-cultural and economic conditions. IT industry is one such domain where women are actively recruited along with men. The current study envisages studying and comparing WLB of men and women employees and identifying the factors influencing WLB.

1.1. Literature Survey

[1] introduces work/family border theory - a new theory about work/family balance according to which, people are daily border-crossers between the domains of work and family. [2] suggests that imbalance arouses high levels of stress, detracts from the quality of life, and ultimately reduces individuals effectiveness at work. Three components to measure work-family balance namely, time, involvement, and satisfaction were identified [3]. There is a direct relationship between satisfaction at work and social domains and work life balance and subjective well-being [4].

According to [5], enough attention has not been towards working conditions of employees of service inclined employees despite understanding the relationship between well-being of the employees and success of the organization. [6] discusses the importance of studying work and family issues in the research, public, and organizational domains, and argues that industrial and organizational psychologists need to focus more on issues and problems within the work and family. [7] examined the relationships of the various facets of work-family balance with organizational commitment and its dimensions among employees working in the service sector in India. A forty-two item four-factor instrument was developed [8] for measuring the WLB of employees working in the service sector. [9] analyzed the work-life balance situation of the Indian hotel employees and its impact on employee productivity. The major objective of the study by [10] was to develop and validate an appropriate tool to illustrate the WLB issues faced by women entrepreneurs in South India. The study by [11] focused on the relationship between role efficacy and emotional intelligence as related to WLB of career women in a southern state of India.

Work-family culture [12] was defined as “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives.” Work-family culture is different from work-family balance as it assesses the perception of the individuals towards organizations’ support for work-family balance. Work-family culture was shown an important concept

related to work attitudes above and beyond what is accounted for by the availability of flexible work arrangements. The use of organizational work-life programs provides many individual and organizational benefits including the reduction of work-family conflict [13][14][15]. Organizational support reduces absenteeism and turnover intention [16]. Improved life satisfaction and well-being and higher organizational performance and productivity were found to be products of a positive organizational environment [17]. It would be appropriate to substitute 'family' in work-family culture with 'life' to include all the non-work aspects of an individuals' life and thus it is called as Work-Life Balance Culture (WLC). [17] have extended and added two more dimensions to the existing work done by [12]. [18] studied the impact of the organizational context related to work-family culture compared with that of broader perceived organizational support.

A study by [19] reported that employees were rewarded less compared to those who did not utilize family-friendly policies. [20] proposed an organization-change approach to promoting WLB. [21] suggests that organizations with more work-family policies have higher perceived firm-level performance. [22] extended prior analyses [23] by examining relationships between two directions of work-family conflict (work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) and withdrawal intentions from public accounting. Work-to-family conflict was found to be positively related to withdrawal intentions. Two new dimensions: Gender expectations and Co-worker support for measuring work-family balance culture were first proposed [24] as explanations for why work-life balance policy usage was low. [25] conducted a study based on gender perceptions on WLB but the study was limited to Chennai.

Men are generally more satisfied with achievements at work where as women tend to balance both family and work lives [26]. Besides being employed, Indian women are burdened with household chores compared to men [27]. [28] views living a balanced life as "achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains, and to do so requires personal resources such as energy, time, and commitment to be well distributed across domains."

II. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Gap & Objectives

In the literature, extensive discussions and studies of WLB are available. The works carried out by previous scholars/researchers have defined WLB, constructed measurement scales [1][2][28][29] and assessed its relation with various dimensions like quality of work life [3]. The studies conducted in Indian context developed measurement scale for WLB and its impact on organizational commitment [7]. Study of WLB in Indian IT sector is limited to organizations or a city in particular [25] but a gender based investigation on WLB, across cities, was not conducted earlier, to the best of the knowledge of the authors. Moreover, the existing studies do not include WLC in the study of WLB.

This gap is addressed by adopting an explorative quantitative approach to compare the WLB among male and female employees working in IT organizations. The present work envisages studying and comparing the WLB of male and female employees of IT industry in South India by adding a new dimension: WLC. Specifically, the aim of the study is to compare and identify the factors influencing WLB.

2.2. Conceptual model for Development of Scale

A questionnaire of 37 statements was prepared to assess the WLB and it consisted two parts: (i) 10 statements to determine the demographic profile of the participants and (ii) 37 statements to assess WLB. Out of the 37 statements, 20 statements correspond to WLC (organizational cultural aspects), i.e., to identify the organizational cultural aspects towards WLB. The second part of the questionnaire employed five-point Likert's scale ranging from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree for obtaining the responses.

Data required for the present study was collected through Survey method from a sample population consisting of employees of various IT organizations in South India. The cities covered in this study are: Hyderabad, Chennai, Bangalore, Pune, Mumbai, Thiruvananthapuram. Random sampling technique was adopted and a total of 1220 employees were invited by e-mail to participate in the survey. Out of 1220 employees, 852 employees filled in the questionnaire and submitted.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

The underlying dimensions (factors) of 37 statements were determined by factor analysis using principal components analysis with varimax rotation method. The reliability of the statements was estimated using Cronbach alpha coefficient [30]. Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (K.M.O) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity was conducted to test the fitness of the data. Pearson's Correlation Analysis extracted the relationship between dimensions and WLB. Regression Analysis was used for determining the directions and magnitudes of associations between the factors and WLB.

III. Results

A total of 852 respondents participated in the survey. 66.66% (568) of the respondents are males and 33.33 % (284) are females. 53.80% of the respondents are of the age: 21 – 30 years. 52% of the respondents are married. All the respondents are full-time employees. The work experience ranges from 1 – 20 years out of which 41 % have an experience of 6 -10 years. The demographic profile is presented in Table 1. The mean ratings of the statements in the questionnaire are presented in Table 2. It also presents the mean ratings individually for male and female employees. Statement 35 was rated the highest with the mean score: 3.62 and statement 37 was rated the lowest with the mean score 2.08. KMO test and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was conducted and resulted in 0.892 and 1525.01 at 0.000 significance level respectively which indicates the sampling adequacy and appropriateness of the responses received.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic factor	Category	%
Sex	Male	66.70
	Female	33.30
Age	21-30	53.80
	31-40	35.90
	41-50	7.70
	>50	2.60
Marital status	Married	52.60
	Single	43.60
	Divorced	2.60
	Separated	1.30
No of dependents	0	53.80
	1	28.20
	2	16.70
	>2	1.30
Qualification	Diploma	1.30
	Bachelors	25.60
	Masters	69.20
	Doctorate	3.80
Employment status	Full time	100
	Part time	0
	Casual	0
Salary	25000-50000	25.60
	50001-75000	17.90
	75001-100000	19.20
	>100000	37.20
Experience	0-5	50
	6-10	41
	11-20	5.10
	>20	3.80
Place of Work	Chennai (120)	12.90
	Bangalore (204)	22.07
	Hyderabad (324)	35.06
	Pune (72)	7.70
	Mumbai (96)	10.30
	Trivandrum (72)	7.70
	Delhi (36)	3.80

Table 2. Mean ratings of the Statements

Item	Statement no.	Mean	SD	Male		Female	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1.	My manager is sensitive to my non-work needs	3.35	1.01	3.33	0.97	3.38	1.13
2.	My manager is sympathetic towards employees’ childcare/elder care responsibilities.	3.54	0.90	3.61	0.85	3.42	1.03
3.	In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first	3.27	1.07	3.37	1.09	3.08	1.06
4.	Employees are allowed to work from home/shifts when required	3.59	1.07	3.76	1.01	3.27	1.15
5.	The workplace is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons	3.12	0.97	3.16	0.92	3.08	1.09
6.	My organization has well laid down work life balance policies	3.24	0.95	3.29	0.90	3.15	1.08
7.	The work life balance policies are applied the same way at all levels of management.	3.03	1.06	3.08	1.02	2.96	1.18
8.	In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives	3.23	1.08	3.27	1.06	3.15	1.16

Item	Statement no.	Mean	SD	Male		Female	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD
9.	Employees who avail work-life balance policies are perceived to be less serious about their careers than those who do not participate	3.10	1.02	3.00	0.92	3.31	1.23
10.	Turning down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will hurt career progress	3.64	0.92	3.73	0.94	3.50	0.91
11.	Employees who use work-life balance policies are less likely to advance in their careers than those who do not use	3.14	0.99	3.10	0.98	3.23	1.03
12.	Employees are expected to work overtime	3.10	1.11	3.10	1.08	3.12	1.21
13.	Employees are expected to put their jobs before their personal responsibilities to move ahead in their careers	3.35	1.02	3.29	1.06	3.46	0.99
14.	Colleagues encourage their team members' use of work-life balance policies	3.34	0.92	3.25	0.87	3.42	1.06
15.	If an employee is away from work due to a work-life balance arrangement, colleagues generally resent to help	3.19	0.99	3.22	0.97	3.15	1.08
16.	Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week	3.23	0.92	3.18	0.87	3.35	1.06
17.	Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies	3.45	0.89	3.41	0.75	3.54	1.14
18.	Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this organization	3.27	1.06	3.31	0.99	3.19	1.23
19.	Male employees are more reluctant than women to ask for time off to deal with their family and non-work responsibilities	3.32	1.05	3.37	1.04	3.23	1.11
20.	Men who put their non-work responsibilities before their jobs are thought of more negatively than women who do this	3.20	1.02	3.16	1.03	3.31	1.05
21.	Work pressure does not allow me to have the personal life I wish	3.10	1.11	3.06	1.08	3.19	1.20
22.	Work demands/deadlines make my personal life stressful (ex: becoming irritable at home, spouse feeling uncomfortable etc..)	3.22	1.07	3.14	1.10	3.38	1.06
23.	Work commitments would keep me pre-occupied and I am not able to fulfil my family responsibilities (ex: taking care of dependents)/not able to attend social functions	3.16	1.07	3.12	1.09	3.27	1.08
24.	Work schedule/pressure is spoiling my health (ex: depression, blood pressure etc.)	3.09	1.07	2.96	1.08	3.35	1.06
25.	Work pressure does not allow me to have proper sleep	2.10	1.20	2.00	1.40	2.20	1.18
26.	Psychological stress from personal/family life distracts me while at work (ex: worrying about dependent care)	3.12	1.04	3.00	1.04	3.38	1.06
27.	Physically tired to discharge my work due to multiple responsibilities at home	3.02	1.04	2.88	1.03	3.31	1.05
28.	Pre-occupation with family/social activities makes me postpone work	2.79	1.02	2.75	0.98	2.88	1.14
29.	Family obligations/demands interfere with work	3.01	0.96	3.04	0.94	2.96	1.06
30.	Personal/ family life support helps me improve motivation, dedication and commitment for work	3.55	1.07	3.69	0.86	3.31	1.41
31.	Interactions and relationships with family members and the experience of managing family issues provide me better soft skills which help my growth in office	3.49	1.05	3.67	0.86	3.15	1.32
32.	Family/personal life builds my self-esteem and confidence at work place	3.53	1.07	3.75	0.87	3.12	1.34
33.	Work place provides me enough opportunities to fulfil my personal/family obligations (ex: maternity leave, carers' leave, study leave etc.)	3.22	1.02	3.22	0.99	3.38	1.13
34.	Work schedule allows me to plan and execute my personal/family responsibilities	3.22	1.05	3.20	1.04	3.27	1.12
35.	Work place contributes to the development of my personality	3.62	0.90	3.73	0.85	3.58	1.03
36.	Work provides me enthusiasm and happiness to pursue my family/personal roles	3.33	1.07	3.39	1.02	3.23	1.21
37.	I have become a better parent/family member because of my work experience	2.08	0.98	2.0	1.20	2.16	0.88

Factor analysis resulted in determining the following nine constructs: Manager Support (MS), Organisational Support (OS), Negative Career Consequences (NCC), Co-worker Non-Support (CNS), Gender Imbalance (GI), Work Interference into Personal Life (WIPL), Personal Life Interference into Work Life (PIWL), Work Enhancement due to Personal Life (WEPL) and Personal Life Enhancement due to Work Life (PEWL). During the factor analysis, only those factors were considered whose Eigen values were greater than one [31] and whose factor loadings were greater than 0.4. Table 3 presents the factor loadings and reliability estimates of the constructs along with the Eigen values and their variances. WIPL has the largest Eigen value 9.79 and contributes about 27.99 percent of the variance making it the most significant dimension of WLC. GI has the lowest Eigen value 1.14 and contributes about 3.28 percent. Construct validity of the questionnaire is established through the factor analysis.

Table 3. Factor loading schedule along with reliability estimates during Factor Analysis

Item no.	Factor Loading	Factor name	Eigen Value	Variance (percent)	Cumulative Variance (percent)	Cronbach alpha
12	0.42	Work Interference into Personal Life (WIPL)	9.79	27.99	27.99	0.86
13	0.42					
21	0.44					
22	0.40					
23	0.52					
24	0.46					
4	0.41	Organizational Support (OS)	4.35	12.44	40.43	0.84
5	0.55					
6	0.74					
7	0.82					
8	0.75					
33	0.84	Personal life enhancement due to work life (PEWL)	2.99	8.57	49.00	0.84
34	0.82					
35	0.65					
36	0.58					
1	0.80	Manager Support (MS)	1.71	4.89	53.90	0.81
2	0.64					
3	0.51					
14	0.46					
26	0.75	Personal Life Interference into Work Life (PIWL)	1.62	4.63	58.52	0.86
27	0.80					
28	0.85					
29	0.80					
30	0.75	Work life enhancement due to personal life (WEPL)	1.58	4.54	63.06	0.90
31	0.81					
32	0.86					
9	0.75	Negative Career Consequences (NCC)	1.25	3.59	63.65	0.86
10	0.25					
11	0.68					
15	0.66	Co-worker Non-Support (CNS)	1.16	3.33	69.98	0.89
16	0.67					
17	0.60					
18	0.73	Gender Imbalance (GI)	1.14	3.28	73.26	0.80
19	0.57					
20	0.45					

The factor analysis resulted in the constructs as agreed upon in earlier works [17][32]. Statement 37 was deleted to increase the reliability and statement 25 was removed as its factor loading was less than 0.4. Finally, the second part of the questionnaire consisted of 35 statements only. Based on the existing works [12][17], the constructs: MS, OS, NCC, CNS, GI are the dimensions of WLC. The sum of the scores of the statements corresponding to these five constructs is taken as the score of WLC.

3.1. Discussions

The total score for WLB is the sum of all the scores of the all the 35 statements for each respondent. WLB has an overall mean score of 107.20 with 17.85 as standard deviation when both male and female employees are considered together. Table 4 and Table 5 present the descriptive statistics of male employees and female employees separately. The average of WLB among male employees is 108.961 where as female employees have an average of 103.769. Male employees have a higher mean of 60.275 for WLC compared to 58.538 of female employees. Both male and female employees have highest mean for WIPL among all constructs. Comparatively, female employees have higher mean 19.192 for WIPL where as male employees have a mean of 18.275 which indicates that women employees experience more interference of work into their personal lives. Similarly, female employees feel more interference of personal life into work than male employees. Both male and female employees have almost same mean for GI which implies that there is indeed gender based imbalance and female employees are preferred to male employees for WLB arrangements. Female employees experience more CNS than male employees where as both have almost same mean for OS. Female employees have significantly higher mean for NCC than male employees which indicates availing WLB arrangements would result in consequences unfavorable to career growth. It is easily deducible from Table 4 and Table 5 that WEPL is higher for both male and female respondents than PEWL which implies respondents can handle enhanced work (WEPL) due to family support, but comparatively the prevailing WLB arrangements do not enhance the personal lives (PEWL). More support on personal front is required for female employees as they experience less WEPL in comparison to male employees.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Male employees

	WLB	WLC	MS	OS	NCC	CNS	GI	WIPL	PIWL	WEPL	PEWL
Mean	108.96	60.27	17.33	12.80	6.39	9.80	9.84	18.27	11.66	14.31	10.31
Std Dev	14.36	9.92	3.39	2.99	1.87	1.90	2.42	3.60	3.14	2.75	2.27
Skewness	-0.29	-0.68	-0.54	-0.67	-0.40	-0.64	-0.19	0.07	0.85	-0.71	-0.16
Kurtosis	0.49	2.40	2.21	0.37	-0.50	-0.43	-0.11	-0.72	0.22	2.48	-0.43

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Female employees

	WLB	WLC	MS	OS	NCC	CNS	GI	WIPL	PIWL	WEPL	PEWL
Mean	103.76	58.53	16.57	12.34	10.03	10.03	9.73	19.19	12.42	12.96	10.07
Std Dev	22.89	12.29	4.38	4.05	2.16	2.73	2.16	3.64	3.68	4.65	3.03
Skewness	-0.85	-0.68	-1.14	-0.18	-0.35	-0.39	0.09	-0.22	0.13	-0.42	-0.58
Kurtosis	1.64	0.68	1.67	-0.64	-1.07	0.22	0.70	-0.57	-0.08	-0.60	0.36

3.1.1. Correlation Analysis

Pearson Correlation Analysis was done on WLB and its constructs to determine the relationships between them. Table 6 and Table 7 present the correlation matrix of male and female employees respectively. For male employees, Correlation analysis revealed that MS, OS, WEPL and PEWL are positively correlated with WLB having correlation coefficients 0.671, 0.675, 0.170 and 0.347 respectively. WLC has the highest correlation coefficient of 0.895 indicating its strong influence for achieving better WLB. NCC, CNS, GI, WIPL, PIWL are negatively correlated with -0.586, -0.575, -0.614, -0.793, -0.436 respectively. For female employees, Correlation analysis revealed that MS, OS, WEPL and PEWL are positively correlated with WLB having correlation coefficients 0.809, 0.828, 0.696 and 0.889 respectively. WLC has the highest correlation coefficient of 0.951 which is higher than the male employees' correlation coefficient (0.895). NCC, CNS, GI, WIPL, PIWL are negatively correlated with -0.433, -0.782, -0.125, -0.854, -0.449 respectively.

Table 6. Correlation Analysis for Male employees

	WLB	WLC	MS	OS	NCC	CNS	GI	WIPL	PIWL	WEPL	PEWL
WLB	1.00	0.89	0.67	0.67	-0.58	-0.57	-0.61	-0.79	-0.43	0.17	0.34
WLC	0.89	1.00	0.77	0.79	-0.58	-0.54	-0.71	-0.63	-0.20	-0.10	0.12
MS	0.67	0.77	1.00	0.64	-0.25	-0.27	-0.44	-0.42	0.08	0.04	0.26
OS	0.67	0.79	0.64	1.00	-0.26	-0.20	-0.47	-0.50	0.04	-0.04	0.13
NCC	-0.58	-0.58	-0.25	-0.26	1.00	0.34	0.24	0.50	0.25	0.03	-0.06
CNS	-0.57	-0.54	-0.27	-0.20	0.34	1.00	0.36	0.47	0.29	-0.04	-0.06
GI	-0.61	-0.71	-0.44	-0.47	0.24	0.36	1.00	0.41	0.39	0.30	0.06
WIPL	-0.79	-0.63	-0.42	-0.50	0.50	0.47	0.41	1.00	0.55	0.13	-0.03
PIWL	-0.43	-0.20	0.08	0.04	0.25	0.29	0.39	0.55	1.00	0.14	0.20
WEPL	0.17	-0.10	0.04	-0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.30	0.13	0.14	1.00	0.72
PEWL	0.34	0.12	0.26	0.13	-0.06	-0.06	0.06	-0.03	0.20	0.72	1.00

^aAll calculations at 0.05 significant level

Table 7. Correlation Analysis for Female employees

	WLB	WLC	MS	OS	NCC	CNS	GI	WIPL	PIWL	WEPL	PEWL
WLB	1.00	0.95	0.80	0.82	-0.43	-0.78	-0.12	-0.85	-0.44	0.69	0.88
WLC	0.95	1.00	0.87	0.84	-0.53	-0.77	-0.13	-0.81	-0.27	0.53	0.84
MS	0.80	0.87	1.00	0.68	-0.30	-0.60	-0.06	-0.55	-0.11	0.53	0.78
OS	0.82	0.84	0.68	1.00	-0.29	-0.67	0.22	-0.79	-0.20	0.46	0.76
NCC	-0.43	-0.53	-0.30	-0.29	1.00	0.28	0.20	0.42	0.11	-0.06	-0.33
CNS	-0.78	-0.77	-0.60	-0.67	0.28	1.00	-0.12	0.69	0.12	-0.63	-0.68
GI	-0.12	-0.13	-0.06	0.22	0.20	-0.12	1.00	-0.02	0.33	0.02	-0.02

WIPL	-0.85	-0.81	-0.55	-0.79	0.42	0.69	-0.02	1.00	0.40	-0.44	-0.67
PIWL	-0.44	-0.27	-0.11	-0.20	0.11	0.12	0.33	0.40	1.00	-0.19	-0.23
WEPL	0.69	0.53	0.53	0.46	-0.06	-0.63	0.02	-0.44	-0.19	1.00	0.67
PEWL	0.88	0.84	0.78	0.76	-0.33	-0.68	-0.02	-0.67	-0.23	0.67	1.00

^aAll calculations at 0.05 significant level

3.1.2. Regression Analysis

WLB is taken as the dependent variable and MS, OS, NCC, CNS, GI, WIPL, PIWL, PEWL, WEPL are considered as independent variables for performing the linear regression analysis. For male employees, the multiple regression coefficient R is 0.997794 and the coefficient of determination R², 0.995593, indicates that 99.55 percent of the variance of the latent construct WLB is explained by its nine factors proving that this regression model is a good fit. F-value from ANOVA is found to be 865.825 with p < 0.05. Table 8 presents the regression beta coefficients for male employees. MS, OS, WEPL & PEWL are significant positive predictors of WLB and NCC, CNS, GI, WIPL & PIWL are negative predictors. Out of all positive predictors, MS and OS influence WLB more than others and out of all negative predictors WIPL and PIWL influence WLB more for male employees.

Similarly, for female employees, the multiple regression coefficient R is 0.986543 and the coefficient of determination R², 0.993595, indicates that 99.35 percent of the variance of the latent construct WLB is explained by its nine factors proving that this regression model is a good fit. F-value from ANOVA is found to be 725.285 with p < 0.05. Table 9 presents the regression beta coefficients for female employees. MS, OS, WEPL & PEWL are significant positive predictors of WLB and NCC, CNS, GI, WIPL & PIWL are negative predictors. Out of all positive predictors, MS and OS influence WLB more than others and out of all negative predictors WIPL and PIWL influence WLB more for female employees.

In comparison, the impact of MS (1.1164) and OS (0.9775) on the WLB of female employees is higher than the influence of MS (0.9981) and OS (0.9185) on WLB of male employees as evident from the Table 7 and Table 8. The impact of WIPL (-1.1683) and PIWL (-1.0148) is significantly higher on the WLB of female employees than the influence of WIPL (-0.9991) and PIWL (-0.9851) on WLB of male employees.

Table 8. Regression Analysis for Male employees

	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>std err</i>	<i>t stat</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	114	9.19E-15	1.24E+16	0
MS	0.99	2.84E-16	3.52E+15	0
OS	0.91	3.71E-16	2.7E+15	0
NCC	-0.82	4.62E-16	-2.2E+15	0
CNS	-0.81	4.21E-16	-2.4E+15	0
GI	-0.92	4.28E-16	-2.3E+15	0
WIPL	-0.99	3.68E-16	-2.7E+15	0
PIWL	-0.98	3.7E-16	-2.7E+15	0
WEPL	0.84	4.11E-16	2.43E+15	0
PEWL	0.95	4.74E-16	2.11E+15	0

Table 9. Regression Analysis for Female employees

	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>std err</i>	<i>t stat</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	111.29	0.91	121.22	1.2E-147
MS	1.11	0.02	44.32	3.33E-86
OS	0.97	0.03	27.39	3.44E-59
NCC	-0.91	0.03	-26.42	2.65E-57
CNS	-0.99	0.03	-25.10	1.19E-54
GI	-1.04	0.03	-28.68	1.23E-61
WIPL	-1.16	0.04	-26.39	3.11E-57
PIWL	-1.01	0.02	-46.16	1.39E-88

WEPL	0.97	0.02	40.51	5.92E-81
PEWL	1.09	0.04	22.86	6.16E-50

IV. Conclusions

The present study is a gender based comparison of WLB among IT employees belonging to various IT organizations of South India. A 35 statement measurement scale is developed for WLB taking organizational *cultural aspects*, into consideration which was not the case in earlier works on WLB. This study reveals that the measured WLB of male employees is higher than female employees. The perception among the male employees regarding the support for WLB from the organizations is also higher among male employees. Both male and female employees experience significant work interference into personal lives and comparatively, female employees suffer more. It is also evident from the study that female employees fear more than their male counterparts about the negative career consequences post availing WLB arrangements. It is observed from the quantitative analysis that WLC is positively correlated with WLB for both male and female employees. The influences of MS, OS, WIPL, PIWL on WLB are more for female employees than male employees.

This study enables organizations to focus on mitigating the interference of work into personal life, particularly more for female employees, and also provides good insights into the employees' perceptions about NCC, CNS and GI faced at work place. The present study augments the existing literature on WLB by adding WLC as an additional dimension and has a very good agreement with the ideas and results generated from previous studies on WLB.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the fellow researchers and faculty members who have supported the work.

References

- [1] Clark, S. C., Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance, *Human Relations*, 53, 2000, 747-770.
- [2] Kofodimos, J. R., *Balancing act*(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993).
- [3] Jeffrey H. Greenhaus, Karen M. Collins, & Jason D. Shaw, The relation between work-family balance and quality of life, *Journal of Vocational behaviour*, 63,2003, 510-531.
- [4] P.Gropel & J. Kuhl, Work-Life Balance and Subjective Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Need Fulfilment, *British Journal of Psychology*, 100(2), 2009, 365-375.
- [5] B.Edvardsson & B. Gustavsson, Quality in the work environment: A prerequisite for success in new service development, *Managing Service Quality*, 13(2), 2003, 148-163.
- [6] Zedeck, K.S, Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns, In: *Zedeck (Ed.), Work Families and Organisations*, San Francisco, 1992.
- [7] Mathew, Rincy V. & Panchanatham, N., An empirical analysis of the impact of various dimensions of work-life balance on organizational commitment among service sector employees in India, *International Journal of Management Studies (IJMS)*, 17 (1), 2010, pp. 129-147. ISSN 0127-8983.
- [8] Mathew, Rincy V. & Panchanatham, N., Development Of A Psychometric Instrument To Measure Work Life Balance, *Continental J. Social Sciences*, 3, 2010, 50 - 58, ISSN: 2141 – 4265.
- [9] Milind A. Peshave & Rajashree Gujarathi, An Analysis of Work-Life Balance (WLB) Situation of Employees and its Impact on Employee Productivity with Special Reference to the Indian Hotel Industry, *Asian Journal of Management*, 5(1), 2014, 69-74, ISSN- 0976- 495X.
- [10] Rincy V. Mathew & N. Panchanatham, An Exploratory Study On The Work-Life Balance Of Women Entrepreneurs In South India, *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 2,2011, 77-105.
- [11] Jyothi Sree V & Jyothi P., Assessing Work-Life Balance: From Emotional Intelligence and Role Efficacy of Career Women. *Advances in Management*, Vol 5 (6),2012,35-43.
- [12] Thompson, C., Beauvais, L., & Lyness, K., When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 54, 1999, 392-415.
- [13] Allen, T.D., Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 58, 2001, 414-435.
- [14] Greenhaus, J. & Parasuraman, S., Work-family conflict, social support and well-being, In *Davidson, M. and Burke, R. (Eds.) Women in management: Current research issue*, London: Paul Chapman, 1994.
- [15] Thiede T. L. & Ganster, D. C., Impact of family-supportive work variables on work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*,80, 1995, 6-15.
- [16] Baltes, B., Briggs, T., Huff, J. & Wright, J., Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 1999, 496-513.
- [17] Bradley, Lisa M., McDonald, Paula K., and Brown, Kerry A., An extended measure ofwork-life balance culture: Development and confirmation of the measure, In *Proceedings of Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Montréal,2010.
- [18] Behson, S.J., Which dominates? The relative importance of work-family organizational support and general organizational context on employee outcomes, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 61, 2002, 53-72.
- [19] Allen, T. D. & Russell, J. E., Parental leave of absence: Some not so family friendly implications, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1),1999, 166- 191.
- [20] Hall, D. T., Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach, *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3),1990, 5-18.
- [21] Perry-Smith, J. & Blum, T., Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43,2000, 1107-1117.
- [22] Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Collins, K. M., Career involvement and family involvement as moderators of relationships between work-family conflict and withdrawal from a profession, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 2001, 91-100.

- [23] Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., Singh, R., & Parasuraman, S., Work and family influences departure from public accounting, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 50, 1997, 249–270.
- [24] McDonald, P., Brown, K & Bradley, L., Explanations for the provision-utilisation gap in work-life policy, *Women in Management Review*, 20(1),2005, 37-55.
- [25] Niharika, D. & Supriya, MV., Gender Differences in the Perception of Work-Life Balance, *Management*,5(4), 2011, 331-34.
- [26] Burke, R. J., Organizational values, job experiences and satisfaction among managerial and professional women and men: Advantage men, *Women in Management Review*, 17 (5),2002, 5–6.
- [27] Singh, B., *Working women in India*, (New Delhi: Anmol, 2004.)
- [28] Kirchmeyer, C., Work-life initiatives: Greed or benevolence regarding workers time, *In C. L.Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), Trends in organizational behaviour*, Vol. 7, 2000, pp. 79–93. West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- [29] Fisher, G., *Work/personal life balance: A construct development study*, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio, USA.
- [30] Cronbach, L.J., Coefficient alpha and internal structure tests, *Psychometrika*, 16,1951, 297-334.
- [31] Hair, J., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C., *Multivariate data analysis*,(5 ed., New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.)
- [32] Fisher-McAuley, G., Stanton, J., Jolton, J., & Gavin, J., Modelling the relationship between work life balance and organisational outcomes, *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial-Organisational Psychology*. Orlando, April 12, 2003, 1-26.

IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) is UGC approved Journal with SI. No. 4481, Journal no. 46879.

Vidyavathi Manupadu. “Who is Achieving Better Work-Life Balance? Men or Women: Study concerning IT Industry in South-India.” *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* , vol. 19, no. 9, 2017, pp. 26–34.